

I am Simply Not There: Narrative Perspective in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*

By

Stephen Froedge

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Classics and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Chairperson Emma Scioli

Tara Welch

Anthony Corbeill

Date Defended: 4/22/2013

The Thesis Committee for Stephen Froedge
certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

I am Simply Not There: Narrative Perspective in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*

Chairperson Emma Scioli

Date approved: 4/22/2013

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to examine Lucan's manipulation of narrative perspective in the *Bellum Civile* as it relates to the characters Pompey and Caesar. In discussing narrative perspective I employ Gérard Genette's distinction between zero focalization and internal focalization. I argue that zero focalization represents what may be termed 'real' in the *Bellum Civile* while internal focalization represents a possibly illusory perception of the events of the narrative from the subjective perspective of one of the narrative's characters. I examine three passages in which Lucan focalizes the narrative perspective to Caesar's vantage point, 7.786-796, 9.964-979, 10.540-546, as well as two passages in which Lucan focalizes the narrative perspective to convey Pompey's point of view, 7.7-19, 9.1-18. These passages correspond in theme, placement and at the level of language. Moreover, within these passages Lucan's use of internal focalization presents images which are difficult for the reader to believe when compared to the events of the *Bellum Civile* set in zero focalization. Ultimately, I contend that Lucan's narrative perspective in these instances exemplifies his purposeful disruption of his reader's ability to determine what is real and what is illusory in the *Bellum Civile*.

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction	1
Section 2: Seeing During Pompey's Dream and Caesar's Bloodlust in Book 7	13
Section 3: Seeing In Space and at Troy in Book 9	27
Section 4: Conclusion	51

Section 1: Introduction

Lucan's *Bellum Civile* is disruptive. By 'disruptive' I mean that Lucan has a penchant for making his reader stop. This is a point which Susan Braund has elegantly commented on, writing that Lucan "has no interest in wafting us swiftly, mellifluously, unthinkingly along."¹ W.E. Heitland made a similar point more than a century earlier, writing of the *Bellum Civile*, "Its flow is broken."² Simply put, the *Bellum Civile* is not a text that is easy to read and the reader is quite often halted as he attempts to wade through Lucan's epic.³

This is an epic that lacks a clear hero⁴ or a clear heroic ideal. This epic also contains halting displays of the gory and the grotesque. For example, there is the horrible slaughter near the beginning of Book 2 in which an unnamed citizen recalls the bloodshed that filled the Tiber river during the time of Sulla: *congesta recepit/ omnia Tyrrhenus Sullana cadavera gurgis./ in fluvium primi cecidere, in corpora summi*. (The Tiber received all the heaps of Sullan cadavers. The first bodies fell into the water, the last bodies fell onto bodies, 2.210-212).⁵ There are also the shocking actions of the witch Erichtho who feeds on the dead in Book 6: *immergitque manus oculis gaudetque gelatos/ effodisse orbes et siccae pallida rodit/ excrementa manus* (she presses her hands into the eye-sockets and she rejoices that she is digging out cold eyes and she

¹ 1992: xlvii.

² 1887: xxxiv.

³ Braund 2011: 507-524, through an analysis of the history of translations of the *Bellum Civile*, argues that Lucan's epic forces his readers to take vehement and disparate stances towards his work.

⁴ See Ahl 1976: 150.

⁵ I have used Shackleton Bailey's 1988 edition for Lucan's *Bellum Civile* in this instance and throughout. This translation and all subsequent translations are my own.

gnaws at the pallid excretions of dry hands, 540-543). The gore within Lucan's epic, of which these two instances are merely an excerpt, disrupt the flow of the narrative and cause the reader, modern and ancient alike, to pause.

Lucan's frequent use of *apostrophe* also disrupts the flow of the narrative by directly addressing the reader.⁶ This is not the only stylistic disruption of Lucan's Latin. In fact, his epic also contains abundant hyperbole and paradox. Paul Roche comments that Lucan's hyperbole "provokes his reader."⁷

Traditionally, scholars have viewed many of these 'disruptive' characteristics as evidence of poetic deficiency.⁸ W.E. Heitland laid out Lucan's four characteristic defects in 1887 as follows: excessive detail, long lists which break the narrative flow, unnecessary narratives and discussions of a descriptive or moralizing nature, and excessive hyperbole.⁹ More recently the charge against Lucan's poetics has been continued by Ronald Mayer in his 1981 commentary of Book 8 who writes of Lucan's style, "Apart from over exuberant writing -- an endearing fault -- there is a general lack of care."¹⁰

Lucan appears to have been saved from scholarly disdain in 1976 with Frederick Ahl's *Lucan: An Introduction*. Ahl's comprehensive analysis strives for a new appreciation of Lucan. In discussing the tone of Lucan's epic and previous criticism, Ahl writes, "Lucan's epic is highly emotional in both content and style, but this is not

⁶ See Roche 2009: 60-61.

⁷ 2009: 58.

⁸ Braund 2010: 5-6 provides a good summary of the scholarly antipathy towards Lucan that began in the late 19th century.

⁹ 1887: lxxiii.

¹⁰ 12.

necessarily a vice. It is indeed one of the facets of the *Pharsalia* that make the poem exciting to read.”¹¹ Ahl’s appreciation of the *Bellum Civile* in general enabled the appreciation of the disruptive aspects of Lucan’s poem which began in the late 1980’s.

Although some disruptive aspects of Lucan’s *Bellum Civile* have been noted since the late 19th century it has only been since W.R. Johnson’s 1987, *Momentary Monsters: Lucan and His Heroes*, and John Henderson’s 1987, “The Word at War,” that the disruptive aspects of the *Bellum Civile* have been fully appreciated. Johnson writes of a disruption that he perceives, among other places, in Lucan’s broken theology¹² and in his employment of the grotesque:

Lucan does not offer the grotesque by way of contrast to the rational; it is not a part of a dialectical pattern from which a sane cosmos emerges in triumphant Hegelian synthesis. It is rather a ubiquitous presence that haunts the entire poem and gradually consumes it. It is not madness here, but reason, that is mere appearance. The reality is madness.¹³

Johnson finds Lucan’s use of the grotesque in his epic to be a constant force that disrupts the reader’s preconceptions of how the cosmos operates. In Johnson’s analysis, the grotesque is not used only for comparison with the force of reason but it subsumes reason itself and becomes an unexpected governing force in Lucan’s *Bellum Civile*.

In Henderson’s analysis, Lucan’s poem is also represented as purposefully disruptive. Henderson begins the second section of his, “The Word at War,” as follows:

Read Lucan. You must read Lucan. His poem breaks rules, inflicts pain and suffering. Don’t bother to reclaim *this* classic in the name of a ‘literature’: this text screams a curse on its readers and upon itself--not at every moment of its

¹¹ 1976: 75.

¹² 1987: 10, writing of Lucan’s epic: “It is the Stoic machine gone mad.”

¹³ *ibid*: 5.

duration, or you may begin to lose the edge of its imprecation, but in a press of destabilizing counter-creation.¹⁴

Henderson discerns a purposeful disruptive essence to Lucan's poem which will and should distress any who read Lucan's poem. Much of the disruption which Henderson discerns is at the level of language, and he contends that "the rhetorical figures of Lucan's text are salient to its semiosis."¹⁵ In Johnson's analysis, Lucan's *Bellum Civile* is chaos described chaotically and for Henderson the intent of this chaotically depicted chaos is highly political. He assesses Lucan's epic as an indictment of war, which leads him to write of Lucan's epic that it is a "programmatic collapse of reader into character into text."¹⁶ Henderson argues that Lucan's poetic program in the *Bellum Civile* is to drag the reader into the characters and to drag the characters themselves into the events of the text so that the reader's sense of self is lost and the reader is able to feel the horrid essence of civil war. Henderson contends that Lucan depicts the horror of war as part of his anti-war agenda by denying the reader a sense of self.

Shadi Bartsch's 1995 work, *Ideology in Cold Blood*, draws on Henderson's approach as Bartsch finds a similar disruption in Lucan's presentation, writing:

the subject was under siege, and this is what Lucan has to show us; and I mean subject in all the senses of the word, from the individual subject of any political regime, to the (usually active) grammatical subject of a sentence. ... *All* these subjects are depicted in collapse in the *Civil War*, fatally disrupted by the mess of human and linguistic boundaries, agency and otherness.¹⁷

¹⁴ 1987: 435.

¹⁵ 1987: 458.

¹⁶ 1987: 476.

¹⁷ 1995: 45-46.

In Bartsch's analysis as in Henderson's, this disruption extends to Lucan's language: for her, any 'subject' that could represent order during civil war, even a grammatical 'subject,' is completely distorted in Lucan's *Bellum Civile* in his effort to represent the disordered nature of the times he depicts.

In spite of this recent trend in appreciating Lucan's disruptive style as an intentional reflection of his theme, Robert Sklenár's 2003 study, *The Taste for Nothingness*, appreciates the grim subject matter and disruptive nature of Lucan's thematic agenda, but does not propose that Lucan's style mirrors his grim agenda. Sklenár maintains that Lucan systematically constructs his universe although Lucan perceives the universe as lacking such a system, arguing that "it is possible to describe chaos without being chaotic, to document with clinical precision the absence of precision in language, to make a logical case for the absence of logic."¹⁸ In Sklenár's estimation, the chaotic nature which Lucan perceives in the universe is not mirrored in the way Lucan crafts his epic concerning that chaotic universe.

Although Sklenár's work is compelling, I disagree with that general premise of Sklenár's work as I perceive the disruptive effect of the *Bellum Civile* as one which permeates every aspect of the poem, especially Lucan's employment of the Latin language. I believe that Lucan attempts to disrupt his reader by chaotically depicting chaos, and on this point my analysis aligns with Johnson, Henderson, and Bartsch.

I perceive a disruption in the *Bellum Civile* but not primarily in theme, theology, the loss of self in Bartsch's analysis, or in the linguistically charged political agenda that Henderson discusses. Rather, I find that Lucan's narrative structure disrupts his

¹⁸ 2003: 2.

reader's understanding of what is real and what is illusory in the *Bellum Civile* and my analysis will center specifically on this disruption within Lucan's narrative structure.

By "real" and "illusory" I am referring strictly to the text of the *Bellum Civile*: I assess the difference between real and illusory at the level of the text as the difference between objective and subjective narration. In objective narrative the reader is typically presented with the omniscient point of view of the narrator, observing and describing the actions of the characters. This type of narration presents an objective perspective of the events of a work and is akin to what we may say is 'real' in the text. However, in subjective narrative the reader is given the subjective perspective of one of the characters of the text and presented with the possibility that the narrative's character is perceiving something illusory.

My analysis of narrative structure in the *Bellum Civile* will repeatedly use the term, 'focalization.' Gérard Genette first applied the term focalization to narrative perspective in his seminal work, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*.¹⁹ Lucan does not present one consistent narrative perspective but shifts his narrative perspective between different focalizations. Genette defines three possible focalizations that can be assessed alongside each other. These possibilities consist of zero focalization, which is objective narrative with an omniscient point of view; internal focalization, which is narrative restricted to the subjective point of view of one of the narrative's characters; and external focalization which is a narrative in which the reader has no knowledge of the characters' thoughts or emotions.²⁰ Throughout the course of

¹⁹ Genette 1980: 185-194; cf. Schmitz 2007: 56-57.

²⁰ 1980: 188-191.

his epic Lucan engages in all of these modes, but the instances of internal focalization are particularly relevant to my analysis of his purposeful disruption of the reader's ability to perceive the events of the *Bellum Civile*.

This dichotomy between what is real and what is illusory is typically illustrated in the *Bellum Civile* through Lucan's employment of different focalizations: zero focalization contains an objective description of the narrative from a completely omniscient point of view while internal focalization represents a subjective description of the narrative that is restricted to the perspective of one of the narrative's characters. Because Lucan often focalizes the point of view of the reader to a character and the character's subjective perspective he prompts the reader to evaluate this subjective vantage point in internal focalization against the objective vantage point set in zero focalization. Therefore, by Lucan's manipulation of these different perspectives the reader's ability to perceive what is real and what is illusory in the *Bellum Civile* is challenged.

In discussing internal focalization, an example from Lucan's *Bellum Civile* may be helpful. In the instances I will look at Lucan presents images that are disruptive for the reader to perceive. The following instance, from the end of Book 1, in which the unnamed matron is recounting a prophetic vision while Rome is in chaos, illustrates an example that is not necessarily disruptive but adequately represents Lucan's internal focalization of narrative perspective: '*video Pangaea nivosis/ cana iugis, latoque Haemi sub rupe Philippos*.' ('I see shining Pangea with snowing peaks and, under the wide rock of Hamos, Philippi,' 679-680). With Lucan's use of *video* (see) at line 679 he internally focalizes the narrative perspective. Lucan invites the reader to perceive with

the matron and allows the reader to see the events of the *Bellum Civile* from within her perspective and also restricts the reader's perspective to the matron's. I will analyze instances where Lucan focalizes the narrative in this way (with verbs of seeing such as *video*) in order to disrupt his reader's perspective through a similar restriction of his reader's perspective to the vantage points of Pompey and Caesar.

I will utilize Genette's theory of focalization throughout my analysis of Lucan's narrative structure as it relates to Pompey and Caesar. I will examine two instances of internal focalization from Book 7 and two instances from Book 9 that are closely related to each other (both at the level of language and context). Lucan begins books 7 and 9 by internally focalizing the narrative perspective within Pompey in a non-corporeal state: Pompey is dreaming in Book 7 and is described as a shadow in Book 9 during his apotheosis. Lucan also internally focalizes the narrative perspective near the end of Book 7 with Caesar's review of the Pharsalian field in Thessaly and in Book 9 with Caesar's review of the Trojan ruins. I will analyze these instances in which Lucan internally focalizes the narrative perspective within Caesar and Pompey, thus allowing the reader to see as Pompey and Caesar see and restricting the reader's perspective to the perspectives of Pompey and Caesar. Lucan consistently presents images which the reader is unable to accurately perceive from the restrictions of Pompey and Caesar's vantage points, and challenges the reader to assess the veracity of the perspectives of Pompey and Caesar.

I believe that this analysis of Lucan's narrative structure as it relates to instances of internal focalization in Books 7 and 9 will help to illustrate the disruptive effect which the *Bellum Civile* presents to its reader. I will examine how Lucan's manipulation of the

narrative perspective in these instances (chiefly through his employment of internal focalization) disrupts his reader's perception of what is real and what is illusory in the *Bellum Civile*.

Lucan's initial characterization of Pompey and Caesar (1.135-157) is consistently recalled in the later instances of internal focalization which I shall analyze. The characterization of Pompey and Caesar in the *Bellum Civile*, which has been treated at length,²¹ is not the focus of my analysis but will serve as a guide as I look at the perspectives of Pompey and Caesar. This characterization begins with Lucan's first introduction of them in Book 1 and the initial similes which he uses to describe them. These two similes take place after Lucan's unique *proem* (1-32) which puts forth no hero and after the invocation of the Emperor Nero (33-66). After recounting the particular political and social circumstances which have led to civil war at Rome (67-128), Lucan introduces Pompey and Caesar and describes both of them with similes. Pompey is likened to an old oak tree and Caesar to a vibrant lightning bolt. In introducing Pompey, Lucan describes Pompey's false belief in his past victories and Pompey's turpitude after years spent away from warfare:

Nec coiere pares. alter vergentibus annis	
in senium longoque togae tranquillior usu	130
dedidicit iam pace ducem, famaeque petitor	
multa dare in vulgus, totus popularibus auris	
impelli plausuque sui gaudere theatri,	
nec reparare novas vires, multumque priori	
credere fortunae. stat magni nominis umbra,	135
qualis frugifero quercus sublimis in agro	

²¹ See Nix 2008 who argues for Caesar's Jupiter-like characterization in Lucan's *Bellum Civile* and especially 282-283 where Nix analyzes the role of lightning from Lucan's simile (1.151-157) in this characterization. See also Rosner-Siegel 1983 on Caesar's characterization as a lightning bolt and Pompey's characterization as an oak.

exuvias veteris populi sacrataque gestans
 dona ducum nec iam validis radicibus haerens
 pondere fixa suo est, nudosque per aera ramos
 effundens trunco, non frondibus, efficit umbram, 140
 et quamvis primo nutet casura sub Euro,
 tot circum silvae firmo se robore tollant,
 sola tamen colitur.

[Nor were they equal. The one with years increasing toward old age, more tranquil because of the long use of the toga, had already unlearned the art of command because of peace, a seeker of fame, he gives many things to the masses, his entirety is compelled by popular winds and he rejoices in the applause of his own theater, nor does he repair his strength anew, and he has great faith in prior success. He stands, the shadow of a great name, just as a high oak tree in a fruitful field, bearing the ancient spoils of the people and the gifts consecrated by the leaders. While it clings with sick roots, fixed by its own weight, and spreading out exposed branches through the sky, it achieves a shadow, not with leaves but with its trunk and although it shakes about to fall to the first East wind and all the trees around it support themselves with firm wood, it alone is praised].

In Lucan's initial description of Pompey's aged state after years spent in civil administration he uses the specific example of Pompey in his theatre, *plausuque sui gaudere theatri* (he rejoices in the applause of his own theater, 133). Lucan employs a similar line when he internally focalizes the narrative perspective within the dreaming Pompey at the beginning of Book 7: *nam Pompeiani visus sibi sede theatri* (for it seemed to Pompey that from the seat of his theater, 9) and I will analyze the significance of this image during Lucan's internal focalization of the narrative perspective in Book 7.

As this simile in Book 1 begins with *qualis* (136), Lucan describes Pompey as a shadow, *umbram* (140), and as a tree, *trunco* (140): Pompey achieves a shadow during the tree simile: *trunco, non frondibus, efficit umbram* (it makes a shadow, not with leaves but with its trunk, 140). Both of these images will reappear in my analysis of disruptive internal focalization within the perspectives of Pompey and Caesar in Books 7

and 9. Moreover, in both instances of internal focalization within Pompey, he is in a non-corporeal form as he also appears in this initial description in Book 1: *stat magni nominis umbra* (he stands, the shadow of a great name, 135). At the beginning of Book 7, (7-19), Pompey is dreaming and at the beginning of Book 9, (1-18), Lucan focalizes the narrative perspective to the shade of Pompey (*umbra*) during his brief apotheosis.

In Book 9 Lucan recalls this use of *truncus* from Book 1 when he describes Pompey's corpse as truncated (*trunci*) at the beginning of Pompey's apotheosis. Lucan also employs *truncus* at the end of the Book 9 during Lucan's account of Caesar's visit to the ruins of Troy (9.964-979). On a more abstract level (beyond the repetition of certain words reminiscent of Pompey's initial characterization) I will examine how Lucan's manipulation of narrative structure casts the 'shadow' of Pompey across the narrative of Books 7 and 9.

Lucan follows the simile of Pompey with the simile of Caesar, comparing him to a lightning bolt. In this passage Lucan again begins by contrasting Caesar and Pompey. Lucan compares Caesar to a lightning bolt that quickly emits flames from within the clouds, spreads those flames across the sky, and then collects its flames:

sed non in Caesare tantum	
nomen erat nec fama ducis, sed nescia virtus	
stare loco, solusque pudor non vincere bello.	145
acer et indomitus, quo spes quoque ira vocasset,	
ferre manum et numquam temerando parcere ferro,	
successus urgere suos, instare favori	
numinis, impellens, quidquid sibi summa petenti	
obstaret gaudensque viam fecisse ruina,	150
qualiter expressum ventis per nubila fulmen	
aetheris impulsu sonitu mundique fragore	
emicuit rupitque diem populosque paventes	
terrui obliqua praestringens lumina flamma:	
in sua templa furit, nullaque exire vetante	155
materia magnamque cadens magnamque revertens	

dat stragem late sparsosque recolligit ignes.

[But not in Caesar was there such a name or the reputation of leadership, but there was courage, unable to stand in place, and the only thing that was shameful for him was not to conquer in war. Rash and indomitable, whenever hope and anger called him he brought his hand and never spared his defiling sword. He urged his own successes and pursued the favor of divine power, coercing whatever stood in his way (as he seeks the greatest things) and he rejoices to have made his way through ruination -- just as a lightning bolt pressed out by winds through the clouds with a din of pressed air and with the groan of the universe glows and snatches away the day and terrifies the fearful people, restricting their vision with its downturned flame, it rages at its own domains and it goes forth with no material forbidding it, falling and returning it sends forth widespread mayhem as it collects its scattered flames].

In this initial description of Caesar, before the simile begins at 151, Lucan establishes Caesar's predilection for ruins: *gaudensque viam fecisse ruina* (rejoicing to have made his way through ruination, 150). This characterization will be echoed as Lucan describes Caesar's visit to the ruins (*ruinae*) of Troy in Book 9 and his active pursuit of Pompey's ruined corpse which I will discuss in Section 3.

The simile itself begins at line 1.151 with *qualiter* and provides further characteristics that will be echoed by Lucan's description of Caesar's perspective in Books 7 and 9. Both passages concerning Caesar in Books 7 and 9 involve him surveying the natural world in a way that disrupts the reader's perception of the landscape: Caesar, and the reader with him, sees things that do not agree with the objective narrative. The lightning bolt, therefore, offers a fitting description. The lightning bolt, in Lucan's simile, creates confusion as it spreads across the cosmos down to earth and Lucan's manipulation of Caesar's perspective will operate similarly across the regions of Thessaly (7.786-796) and Troy (9.964-979). Through Caesar's eyes a picture of the landscape is presented which disrupts the reader just as the lightning bolt disturbs the perspective of people: *populosque paventes / terruit obliqua praestringens*

lumina flamma (and it terrifies the fearful people, restricting their vision with its downturned flame, 1.154). I will describe how Caesar's perspective, like lightning from the aether, 'scorches' the perspective of Lucan's reader.

I have chosen to discuss Lucan's initial characterization of Pompey because this characterization contains specific words, *truncus* and *umbra*, which Lucan employs in the instances of internal focalization to the perspective of Pompey that I will discuss. Similarly, I have chosen to discuss Lucan's initial characterization of Caesar because Lucan crafts Caesar's perspective in a way that evokes this lightning bolt simile during the instances of internal focalization I will analyze. Moreover, Lucan's parallel placement of these initial characterizations of Pompey and Caesar mirrors Lucan's parallel placement of the perspectives of Pompey and Caesar in Books 7 and 9. These similes do not represent Lucan's manipulation of narrative perspective which will be the focus of my analysis; however, these initial characterizations will be recalled and will serve as a guide while I analyze Lucan's use of internal focalization (within Pompey and Caesar) to disrupt the reader's perspective as the reader attempts to distinguish what is real from what is illusory in the *Bellum Civile*.

Section 2: Seeing During Pompey's Dream and Caesar's Bloodlust in Book 7

The seventh book of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* contains the pivotal battle of his epic. In this book Pompey loses the battle of Pharsalus to the forces of Caesar, and Pompey's cause is utterly ruined.²² This book begins with Pompey's dream on the eve of battle and concludes with Caesar's triumphant inspection of the Thessalian field after

²² Thorne 2011, writes, "At the culmination of the battle when Pompey flees the field, Lucan declares (7.689-697) that from this point onward those who fight no longer do so for Pompey." Fantham 2010: 70 claims, "for Caesar Pharsalus itself was closure."

the battle. An examination of this book reveals numerous examples of this disruptive effect upon the reader.

The narrative until Book 7 recounts the maneuvers of Pompey and Caesar. Book 2 is concerned with Caesar's actions in Northern Italy and Pompey's actions at Capua (392-525). Cato appears for the first time in Book 2 (234-391) but will not be seen again until Book 9 which I will discuss later. In Book 3 Caesar besieges Pompeian forces at Masillia (298-398) while Pompey himself has fled Italy. Book 4 begins with Caesar's conflict with the Pompeian generals, Afranius and Petreius (1-401) and the remainder of Book 4 contains 'proxy' conflicts which do not involve Caesar or Pompey directly: the Caesarian Marcus Antonius escapes harassment by Pompeian forces in Illyria (402-452) and the Caesarian general Curio fights the Pompeian Varus in Libya (581-714). In Book 5 Pompey is given the full command of the Republican forces by the exiled senate (1-64) while Caesar faces and overcomes a mutiny and a storm (374-721). As Ahl points out, much of the narrative until Book 7 is also concerned with 'minor' characters: "The *Pharsalia* is an epic rich in the multiplicity and variety of its minor characters. Indeed, the first six books (especially 3 through 6) are divided evenly between the minor characters and the three protagonists, Pompey, Caesar, and Cato."²³ Domitius appears at 2.478 and occupies a significant portion of the narrative and Scaeva is given a full aristeia in Book 6 (118-262). In fact, the second half of Book 6 follows Sextus Pompeius as he goes to visit the witch Erictho (413-830). As Book 7 begins Lucan's narrative is more consistently concerned with Pompey and Caesar.

²³ 1976: 116.

effigiem Romanae cernere plebis (for it seemed to Pompey that from the seat of his theater he discerned the countless likenesses of the Roman plebeians). The verb *video*, in the passive voice, is the standard way to describe a dream: at *Aeneid* 2.270-271 Vergil uses *visus* to describe Aeneas's dream of the ghost of Hector.²⁵ Although the use of *visus* alone does not indicate any peculiar aspect to Pompey's dream, within this dream Lucan employs further references to perception which heighten the interpretive nature of Pompey's dream. The verb *cernere* (discern) implies the physical act of seeing²⁶ and by using this verb Lucan allows the reader to see the dream image with Pompey. In fact, Lucan provides two layers of perception by making the verb *cernere* (discern) dependent upon *visus* (seem). Lucan further emphasizes the interpretability of this dream with the direct object of the verb *cernere* (discern), *effigiem* (likeness). *Effigies* refers to a fake imitation of something real and here refers to the fake likeness of the Roman plebeians within Pompey's mind.²⁷ The reader's perspective is restricted to the dream image with Lucan's use of *cernere* (discern) and *visus* (seem) and this perception is not made of something solid but upon only the *likeness* of real people. In Pompey's subjective dream the reader sees the representation (*effigies*) of a perception (*cernere*) of a vision (*visus*) and is thus removed from what may be real by three levels of subjective perception. By internally focalizing his narrative within this dream Lucan brings the reader into Pompey's psyche and prompts the reader to make his own judgments concerning the substance of the dream.

²⁵ *In somnis, ecce, ante oculos maestissimus Hector/ visus adesse mihi* (In dreams, behold, before my eyes I seem to see Hector, most sad).

²⁶ This verb can also imply judgement, see O.L.D., s.v., *cerno* especially definitions 5 and 6.

²⁷ O.L.D., s.v., *effigies*, definitions 1-4 and especially definition 2, "A copy, representation."

Keeping in mind Lucan's description of the dream at line 9 as a *vana ... imagine* (illusory ... image) the reader's interpretation of the dream appears simple: the dream is nothing more than an illusion and the reader should interpret it as an illusion distinct from the objective narrative and historical fact. However, Lucan complicates this potential interpretation of this dream image (lines 10-13) by connecting it to the historical world (lines 14-20) via a simile. With this simile Lucan appears to blur the distinctions between historical facts and Pompey's dream. At line 13 Lucan compares the dream to the remembrance of something that actually happened, referring to specific historical events at lines 15-20,²⁸ and connects the dream image to these historical images with *qualis ... facies* (such ... was the sight). This use of *facies* qualifies the type of image which Lucan's reader must interpret. The noun *facies* refers to the particular, outward appearance of something -- the state of something as it appears to the observer²⁹ -- and by employing this noun Lucan allows the reader to understand *facies* in various ways. In this instance, the noun may refer to the historical past and be used within the simile to elucidate the dream image. However, this simile could operate conversely and illuminate the real world through the dream. Ultimately, the reader does not know whether to interpret the image of the historical past through the dream or to evaluate the dream through the historical past. Lucan invites the reader to interpret *facies* which acts, within the simile, as a conduit between the image presented in the dream and historical facts; therefore, Lucan's reader needs to reevaluate his

²⁸ Dilke 1965: 85, and Fratantuono 2012: 269-270 among other commentators point out that the triumph is actually mistakenly described here by Lucan. At any rate, this reference to historical events appears to connect the dream to historical fact even if Lucan did not know his history as well as he should have.

²⁹ O.L.D., s.v., *facies*, definitions 1-11 and especially definitions 2c, "appearance as indicative of condition," and 6a, "A thing presented to view, sight, scene, the sight of something being enacted, a spectacle."

preconceived notions concerning dreams. As a result of this reevaluation the reader needs to interpret the relation of dreams to historical fact and is left, ultimately, without a sense of what is real and what is illusory in this book of the *Bellum Civile*.

Lucan never clearly allows the reader to leave this fantasy and even directly orders Pompey's guards to let the general sleep and, therefore, prolong the dream at lines 24-25: *ne rumpite somnos,/ castrorum vigiles, nullas tuba verberet aures*. (Do not break the slumbers, night watchmen of the camp, let the bugle strike no ears).³⁰ With this line Lucan also orders the dreamer to continue sleeping by ordering the bugles not to sound which, perhaps, causes the dreamer to dream indefinitely. Although the reader knows that Pompey will eventually wake up,³¹ the dream never specifically ends;³² therefore, the reader never leaves the *vana ... imagine* (illusory ... image) of Pompey's dream. Lucan's choice to never directly stop the dream sets up his account of the Battle of Pharsalus and its aftermath which will further disrupt the reader's preconceptions about what is real and what is illusory in the *Bellum Civile* through his use of internally focalized narrative perspective.

From this dream without a clear conclusion for the reader, Lucan begins his account of the events leading up to this pivotal battle. He records the pre-battle speeches of Cicero (68-122), Caesar (250-328) and Pompey (342-382) and a lengthy authorial aside concerning the dreadful repercussions of the Battle of Pharsalus

³⁰ See also D'Alessandro Behr 2007: 82 and Walde 2001: 408-409 on these lines and how they relate to Pompey's dream.

³¹ Night ends at line 7.45: *vicerat astra iubar* (brightness had defeated the stars) but the dream is no longer referenced.

³² Morford 1967: 76 confines Pompey's dream passage to lines 7.7-24. Ahl 1976: 180 contends that the dream ends at 7.36 but does not explain the lack of any specific mention of Pompey waking up.

[Nevertheless, after all things were suffered [by Caesar], a clear day uncovered the losses at Pharsalia. No sight of the place recalls his eyes clinging to the killing fields. He discerns rivers propelled by gore and bodies equal in mass to elevated mountains, he sees heaps descending into gore, and he counts the multitude of Magnus and that location is prepared for a feast from which he can recognize the faces and sight of the dead. It is a delight for him not to discern the Emathian earth and to review with his eyes the fields hiding under slaughter. He makes out, in the bloodshed, Fortuna and his gods].

Two versions of the Pharsalian field are referenced in this passage as Lucan describes both the natural, physical landscape and a new scene of carnage that has just been added after the Battle of Pharsalus. These versions of the field are both signaled by *facies*, one at 787 which relates to the natural landscape and the other at 793 which relates to the bloodshed on the field. This first use of *facies* marks the sight of a natural landscape because it is described by the descriptive, genitive noun, *loci*. *Locus* is a word which generally refers to a neighborhood or region³⁴ and in this case refers to the physical characteristics of Thessaly. *Facies* refers to the specific outward state of something and this particular outward state is described as non-existent with the adjective *nulla*.³⁵ This is one version of the field that is described in this passage, and Lucan's use of the adjective *nulla* makes it clear that this version of the field is not discernible through the internally focalized narrative perspective. In this instance the field which the reader may expect and which agrees with the objective narrative, i.e., the natural landscape of Thessaly, is referenced but not seen.

³⁴ O.L.D., s.v., *locus*, definitions 1 a, b, c.

³⁵ Haskins 1887: 265 takes *nulla* adverbially with *revocat*. Therefore, the *facies* of the physical landscape recalls the *haerentes oculos* in no way. Whether one takes *nulla* with *facies* or adverbially, the appearance of the region is unable to remove Caesar's clinging eyes.

The physical landscape of this region is not seen on this day, for it is hidden beneath another version of the field, the *feralibus arvis* (killing fields) with which Lucan ends line 788 but does not conclude the sentence. This sentence is concluded with a further reference to perspective in the form of Caesar's *haerentes oculos* (clinging eyes) at 789 which are clinging to these killing fields. As Lucan's description continues, this gory version of the field is also marked by *facies* at 793: *vultus ex quo faciesque iacentum/ agnoscat* (from which he can recognize the faces and sight of the dead). The grotesque version of the field (marked by *facies*) is not described by *nulla* as the natural landscape was, but by the bodies which are covering the natural landscape, bodies that Caesar can discern and that the reader discerns from Caesar's vantage point.

There is a fundamental change presented during this narrative shift the morning after the battle of Pharsalus. By bordering this internally focalized narrative between *cernit* (789) and *cernit* (796), Lucan recalls Pompey's dream and the importance of *cerno* (discern) within Lucan's narrative at the book's beginning. The version of the field that Caesar discerns is not the one categorized by *loci* but the one marked by the *feralibus arvis* (killing fields). Caesar, and through his eyes, the reader, does not see a natural river but one which is propelled by slaughter at 789. The normal river exists in the objective narrative but no part of the normal river is visible through Caesar's eyes. Hills also appear but only as a point of reference to describe the gory landscape: Lucan depicts heaps of corpses equaling the height of mountain peaks (790-791). *Corpora* (bodies) is the direct object of *cernit* (immediately presenting the field that Caesar discerns) and is emphatically enjambed on the next line where it is placed just after *colles* (mountains), which refers to the physical landscape. The Thessalian landscape is

referenced but only in an abstract sense: real mountains are used as a measuring tool for these new body-mountains. The reader, as the narrative perspective has been focalized through Caesar, does not see the objective and expected version of Thessaly but only this landscape of slaughter.

As the description continues, Lucan sends the reader further into Caesar's perspective and further demarcates the two versions of this field: *iuvat Emathiam non cernere terram,/ et lustrare oculis campos sub clade latentes* (it is a delight for him not to discern the Emathian earth and to review, with his eyes, the fields hiding under slaughter, 794-795). Lucan explains what is pleasing for Caesar's eyes to survey and draws a distinction between the expected landscape and the slaughter which Caesar surveys. It is pleasing for Caesar not to discern the *terram* (794), and the *campos* (fields) of the normal Thessalian plains are referred to as *sub clade latentes* (hiding under slaughter). Lucan delineates both fields: the *campos*, representing the physical landscape, are present but completely unseen by Caesar and the reader within the focalized narrative because it is hidden under the adjective *nulla* (788) which has denied the possibility of seeing that version of the field.

Lucan then uses *cernit* (discerns) once more as he explains the extent to which there has been a significant change after the Battle of Pharsalus: *fortunam superosque suos in sanguine cernit* (He makes out, in the bloodshed, Fortuna and his gods, 796). Not all manuscripts contain this line; however, most editors, including Shackleton Bailey, do not strike this line from the text.³⁶ It is possible to read this passage as a comment

³⁶ Weise 1835: 251 maintains this line and its placement without brackets or commentary. Haskins 1887: 265 notes its omission in other manuscripts and cites the repetition of *cernere* as "objectionable," but maintains the line in its location. Housman 1927: 218 writes that the line is worthy of Lucan and fitted to Lucan's purpose. Dilke 1965: 79 brackets this line but does not explain his reasoning.

upon Caesar's changed relationship to the gods and Fortuna at this point in the epic with the Battle of Pharsalus behind him because he has defeated all opposition and the gods and Fortuna are now on his side. Modern commentaries do not appear to treat this line directly, with the exception of Braund, who writes, "Caesar interprets the slaughter as a sign of supernatural favor."³⁷ Jane Wilson Joyce's translation supports this possible reading³⁸ which takes *suos* as predicative to *superos*. Therefore, *cernit*, in this reading, sets up an indirect statement with a supplied *esse*, and Lucan's point is that Caesar realizes that Fortuna and the gods have now become *suos* (his). This reading communicates a change in the political allegiance of these divine beings. Therefore, Joyce and Braund take *in sanguine* (in bloodshed) causally; they also use *in sanguine* (in bloodshed) as synecdoche for the slaughter of the battle of Pharsalus which enabled this change in political allegiance.

However, by taking *suos* as an attributive adjective, as I contend, and not part of an indirect statement this passage aligns more closely with Caesar's belief in his relationship to Fortuna. Caesar has, throughout Book 7 and the *Bellum Civile* as a whole, perceived Fortuna as with him. Fortuna is perhaps no less temperamental in Lucan than she is in Latin literature in general; however, Caesar's faith in her benevolence towards him does not waver up to this moment. At 7.285-287, for example, Caesar claims that Fortuna is with him before the battle begins: *sed me Fortuna meorum/ commisit manibus, quarum me Gallia testem/ tot fecit bellis* (But Fortuna has made me the witness to those who achieved in Gaul through so many wars with their

³⁷ 2009: 81.

³⁸ Joyce 1993: 193 translates, "he sees proof in this blood that Luck and Gods Above are his."

hands).³⁹ Before the Battle of Pharsalus, Caesar perceived Fortuna on his side or, at the very least, he was completely willing to risk everything by siding with her; therefore, there appears to be something else which is significant about what Caesar discerns in the blood on the battlefield at line 796 besides a change in the allegiance of Fortuna and the gods to Caesar's side.

Caesar's perspective presents a different version of the Thessalian landscape. At 796 the audacity of this change is quite pronounced; above I examined a field which had held normal, natural characteristics completely transformed, but now, at 796, the reader discerns the transformation of divine beings. The reader saw new types of mountains made of bodies and now by reading *suos* not as predicative but simply as an attributive adjective the reader sees Caesar's gods and Fortuna herself covered in the blood that Caesar has spilled. Rivers are no longer powered by natural locomotion but moved by gore, and the divine have been refashioned as well. Lucan employs the adjective *superos*, which can refer to both human beings and the gods based on relative position.⁴⁰ He appears to be using the adjective substantively to refer to divine beings based on its placement parallel with *fortunam*. However, Lucan also appears to be toying with the possibilities inherent within this adjective, *superos*. When this adjective is used substantively with relation to beings below the earth then it can mean human beings who are above the earth.⁴¹ But if the adjective is used in relation to human

³⁹ See also 7.24, 7.645, 7.666, 7.686, 7.734 and especially at 1.224-226 and 2.699 during critical parts of Caesar's endeavor he calls upon Fortuna and does not appear to doubt her nearness.

⁴⁰ O.L.D., s.v., *superos*, definitions 1, 2, and 3.

⁴¹ In fact, Lucan employs this very usage 26 lines before at 770: *manibus, et superam Stygia formidine noctem*. Here, *superam* refers to the night air above and is given this relative definition based on its proximity to *terram* (earth) at 7.768.

beings, as it is here, it can refer to the gods who are above human beings. Because Lucan uses *superos* to describe divine beings in relation to Caesar they should be in a position above him. However, Caesar perceives these divinities now in blood and, as a result, the reader must interpret Caesar as looking down at these *superos* and at *fortunam* on the Thessalian ground, the site of the battle's slaughter. At the level of language the word *sanguine* would certainly recall *cruore* at 789 and *clade* at 795, which refer to the actual gore on the battlefield. As a result of Lucan's description of these divinities in blood, the *superos* are recast in Caesar's eyes as divinities that are not above but below.

Lucan appears to craft this line in a purposefully disruptive manner: Lucan uses this adjective to refer to the gods above but also places them in a position below Caesar's perspective and below the reader's. Lucan could have used many different identifiers for the divine but he uses one that confounds its own definition. Things which have been *superos* (above) are now below Caesar and are no longer properly identified with this adjective although this is the very adjective which Lucan employs. Lucan, through Caesar's perspective, transforms the definition of *superos* and the divine forces to which the adjective refers and disrupts the reader's very understanding of the word.⁴² Caesar sees these divinities on the earth below him; however, they are not on the natural earth (Lucan informed the reader two lines prior that Caesar does not see this) but the slaughter upon the earth -- *in sanguine* (in bloodshed).

⁴² Henderson 2010: 444 makes a similar point about Lucan's treatment of the name *Scaeva*, writing, "the word is caught up in the 'civil war' of Lucan's text, where opposed senses tear themselves up and rip the signifiers away from signification."

This shift to Caesar's perspective during his bloodlust is not a digression. Lucan prompts his reader to see like Caesar and he propels his reader into Caesar's subjective perspective in which one can only see a single version of this Thessalian field while the other version is hidden by the use of the term, *nulla loci facies* (788). The natural world is obscured by the gory aftermath; simultaneously the divine are moved from above mankind to below them. By internally focalizing the narrative perspective, Lucan only allows the reader to see through Caesar's perspective on the field of battle and the gods-on-high-now-plunged-below.

However, before the book's conclusion, Lucan combines both versions of this field into one image; thereby, he implies that there is but one field. The internally focalized narrative perspective was not meant to send the reader into the mind of a madman perceiving something unreal, but to present the reader with a different and unsettling glance at what may be perceived as real in the *Bellum Civile*: *Latiae pars maxima turbae/ fastidita iacet; quam sol nimbiue diesque/ longior Emathiis resolutam miscuit arvis* (the greatest part of the Latin crowd lay out, forsaken; which the sun and storms and a longer day mixed -- dissolved -- into Emathian fields, 844-846). Here the slaughter -- the corpses of the killing fields discussed above -- is referred to as the greatest part of the Latin crowd and represents the gore which Caesar discerned. By the efforts of time (the sun and longer days and storms) these corpses are transformed and mixed into the natural ground of this Thessalian field. Lucan, in the end, mixes the gore into the natural landscape. He combines both fields that have been presented through this internally focalized narrative as quite distinct and prompts the reader once again to question what is real and what is illusory in the *Bellum Civile*.

In Book 7 Lucan uses specific words, *cerno*, *facies*, and *video* to shift the perspective of his narrative into internal focalization. In these shifts to internally focalized narrative perspective, one set within Pompey and the other within Caesar, Lucan destabilizes the reader's perception of what is real and what is illusory in the *Bellum Civile*. He achieves this disruption with Pompey by obscuring the distinction between dreams and historical fact. With Caesar, Lucan's internally focalized narrative perspective challenges the reader's perception of the physical landscape of Thessaly. Lucan even disrupts his reader's understanding of the meaning of words through his manipulation of *facies* 13, 788 and 793 and his distortion of *superos* at 796. Through Lucan's narrative structure in this book he disrupts his reader's perception of what is real and what is illusory in the *Bellum Civile*.

Section 3: Seeing In Space and at Troy in Book 9

The ninth book of Lucan's epic has been the subject of much scholarly attention. This is Lucan's longest book and the second longest book of epic poetry in Latin literature.⁴³ The book begins with Pompey's apotheosis (1-18) after his decapitation at the end of Book 8 (663-691). It also contains the longest sustained treatment of Cato which continues, for the most part uninterrupted, from line 19 until 949 which is significant because it is Cato's first appearance since Book 2. Within this treatment of Cato the final destruction of the Pompeian cause is realized in the deserts of Africa. This sustained treatment of Cato has been the focus of arguments which laud Cato's heroism.⁴⁴ This book also contains the episode where Cato reaches the Oracle at

⁴³ See Fratantuono 2012: 351 who cites Lucretius' *de Rerum Natura* 5 as the longest book of Latin epic at 1457 lines whereas Lucan's 9th book of the *Bellum Civile* is 1108 lines.

⁴⁴ Tipping 2011 throughout but especially 232-236. Ahl 1976: 231-279 and especially 278.

Ammon (9.511-586) which is of particular importance to Lucan's characterization of Cato⁴⁵ and this book recounts Caesar's reaction to the ruins of Troy,⁴⁶ culminating with his entrance into Egypt (999) where Lucan's epic will ultimately conclude.

Book 9 is also an appropriate place to continue my analysis of Lucan's disruptive use of narrative perspective in the *Bellum Civile*. As with Book 7, this book begins with an instance in which Lucan internally focalizes the narrative perspective through Pompey. Book 7 began with Pompey's dream (7-19) and, as Book 9 begins, Lucan presents the beginning of Pompey's longest dream, namely his death (9.1-18). The connection between death, sleep and dreams in the ancient mind goes as far back as Hesiod's *Theogony* in which the three are described as offspring of Night: νύξ δ' ἔτεκεν ... / καὶ Θάνατον, τέκε δ' Ὕπνον, ἔτικτε δὲ φύλον Ὀνειρώων (and Night gave birth to Death, Sleep, and the clan of dreams, 211-212). This connection is also made, in passing, in Book 9 of the *Bellum Civile* during Cato's march through the deserts of Libya. In this episode, Lucan presents an etiological reason for the variety of poisonous snakes in this desert. In Lucan's account, Perseus carries the snaky head of the slain Medusa over Libya because Pallas tells him to avoid leaking Medusa's blood over Europe and this is the reason that Libyan snakes are so toxic. In recounting Perseus' assault on Medusa while she is sleeping, Lucan writes, *quam sopor aeternam tracturus morte quietem/ obruit haud totam* (sleep, which hardly overwhelmed all of her, was about to draw out eternal rest in death, 670-672).

⁴⁵ Ahl 1976: 262-268; Joyce: 1987: 228.

⁴⁶ Johnson 1987: 119 says of the importance of this instance, "Naturally, he must pause and attend to this spot with special reverence."

In Book 7 Lucan describes Caesar surveying the Emathian plains after the Battle of Pharsalus (786-796), as analyzed above, and in Book 9 he describes Caesar surveying the ruins of Troy (964-979). In fact, this episode is the first appearance of Caesar in the epic since the morning after the Battle of Pharsalus in Book 7. These two books both begin with examples of Lucan's manipulation of the narrative perspective of Pompey and end with Lucan's manipulation of the narrative perspective of Caesar.

Pompey's apotheosis in Book 9 begins on Earth with Pompey's cremation in Egypt and the departure of his soul from his funeral pyre. Lucan describes the inability of the earth to restrain Pompey's soul as his soul leaps away from the fire and his body. Pompey's soul then travels to the vault of heaven and Lucan describes the outer darkness of the cosmos and the orbit of the moon. What follows is, more or less, an exegesis indebted to Stoicism in which Lucan describes the type of half-divine beings which inhabit this region because of their virtue in life.⁴⁷ The Stoic exegesis continues with Lucan's claim that souls which are buried with excessive pomp do not approach this region, at which point Pompey stops to observe the cosmos and, once he has seen how night operates, his soul laughs at the mockery made of his corpse on Earth. After laughing at this and, perhaps, letting go of all the anxieties of life,⁴⁸ Pompey returns to the Earth from which he has recently departed and on which the passage began. On his return journey, Pompey flies over the fields at Emathia, the sight of his great defeat, and he comes upon Brutus and Cato still alive. The passage concludes with Pompey

⁴⁷ On the Stoicism of this portion of the passage in particular, see Kubiak 1985: 54.

⁴⁸ Ahl 1976: 253 notes a change in Pompey because of his ethereal travels before he enters Brutus and Cato: "the spirit of Pompey that enters the breasts of Cato and Brutus at the beginning of Book 9 has been purified and filled with the pure light of the aether beyond the terrestrial sphere."

implanting himself inside Brutus and Cato as a *vindex scelerum* (the avenger of crimes, 17).

This descent from the cosmos back to the Earth could also be read as a bathetic aside. The passage contains a grand description of the distant cosmos and then descends to the image of Pompey's decapitated corpse, which is described as *ludibria* (mockery, 14). Fratantuono describes the transition from the ether to the corpse as a progression from lofty Stoic ideals to a bastardization of those ideals, in which Fratantuono sees Lucan's wry mockery of Stoic ideals.⁴⁹

In fact, Pompey's apotheosis raises many questions concerning Lucan's Stoicism. Scholars have normally treated the first portion of Pompey's apotheosis as uniformly Stoic but the second part, when Pompey's soul returns to Earth and enters Brutus and Cato, as anti-Stoic. Fratantuono claims that the second part of this episode and the description of Pompey's soul do not represent Stoic ideology: "No Stoic philosopher or imitative poet ever claimed that a shade--an *umbra*--could take a short sojourn to the ether and then plunge down into the *pectus* or *mens* of not one but two living beings."⁵⁰ Emanuele Narducci also points to Lucan's use of *manes* and *umbra* as evidence that this scene is not representative of Stoic ideology⁵¹ and Tracy comments, in passing, on "the unorthodoxy of such a conclusion to a scene of astral apotheosis."⁵² However, Berthe Marti sees the final portion of this passage as representative of Stoic

⁴⁹ 2012: 352.

⁵⁰ 2012: 353. Housman 1927: 255 describes where Pompey's soul has traveled beginning at line 4 by referencing Chrysippus' (the Stoic philosopher) description of the cosmos. See also Grimal 2010: 66n25.

⁵¹ 2002: 346.

⁵² 2011: 45n12.

conceptions of humanity.⁵³ Marti believes that Pompey realizes a Stoic ideal by entering Brutus and Cato, writing that “by living in Brutus and Cato his soul will at last attain perfection.”⁵⁴ As with much of the *Bellum Civile*, this episode does not clearly reveal the nature of Lucan’s unique brand of Stoicism. Along with the significance to the question of Lucan’s Stoicism that this episode contains, Lucan’s narrative structure in this episode presents challenges to his reader. I will now turn to a detailed analysis of the passage.

At non in Pharia manes iacuere favilla nec cinis exiguus tantam compescuit umbram; prosiluit busto semustaque membra relinquens degeneremque rogam sequitur convexa Tonantis. qua niger astriferis connectitur axibus aer	5
quodque patet terras inter lunaeque meatus, semidei manes habitant, quos ignea virtus innocuos vita patientes aetheris imi fecit et aeternos animam collegit in orbes. non illuc auro positi nec ture sepulti	10
perveniant. illic postquam se lumine vero implevit, stellasque vagas miratus et astra fixa polis, vidit quanta sub nocte iaceret nostra dies risitque sui ludibria trunci. hinc super Emathiae campos et signa cruenti	15
Caesaris, ac sparsas volitavit in aequore classes, et scelerum vindex in sancto pectore Bruti sedit et invicti posuit se mente Catonis.	

[But the shade did not remain in the Pharian ash, nor did the paltry embers devour such a shade; [Pompey’s *umbra*] leapt from the pyre, leaving behind partially burned limbs and the base funeral pile. He approaches the vault of the Thunderer where the black aether is connected on the star-bearing axes and the space that lies open between the earth and the movements of the moon -- there the semi-divine phantoms dwell -- those whom, innocent in life, fiery virtue made capable of enduring the lowest aether and fiery virtue collects the soul into eternal orbits. Not there do those approach who have been buried with gold or entombed with incense. After he filled himself with that true light and there he marveled at the wandering celestial figures and the stars fixed on the poles, he

⁵³ 1945: 373 In particular, he compares the Stoicism of this passage to the Stoicism of Seneca.

⁵⁴ *ibid.*

saw under how great night our day rests and he laughed at the mockery of his decapitated corpse. From here he flew over the plains of Emathia and the standards of bloody Caesar and the fleets spread out in the water and, the avenger of crimes, he settled in the sacred chest of Brutus and in the mind of unconquered Cato].

In Pompey's apotheosis, Lucan describes the cosmological region in detail (5-11) before he focalizes the narrative to Pompey's perspective (11-14). In other words, Lucan guides the reader to this cosmological region before he describes how Pompey perceives this cosmological region. By doing this Lucan presents the objective narrative clearly before focalizing to Pompey's perspective.

Lucan gives the reader a specific directional cue: he sends the reader's eyes skyward with the accusative after a verb of motion: *convexa Tonantis* (the vault of the Thunderer). Lucan then describes this region as *qua niger astriferis connectitur axibus aer* (where the black aether is connected on the star-bearing axes, 9.6) and he continues to offer further details concerning the cosmos: *quodque patet terras inter lunaeque meatus* (what lies open between the earth and the movements of the moon, 9.7). Elaborating on this description, Lucan even describes the types of spirits that dwell in this region: *semidei manes habitant* (the semi-divine shades dwell, 9.7). Although the meaning of these descriptors may be difficult to discern, it is important to note that Lucan takes effort to describe this fantastical region from an objective narrative perspective.

After Lucan has provided this clear image of the region, he makes a transition from zero to internal focalization and from objective perspective to a subjective perspective. Lucan begins the sense unit on line 11 with the deictic, *illuc* (there), pointing the reader to Pompey's whereabouts and informing the reader where Pompey's shadow is now located as he focalizes the narrative perspective. The internal focalization of the

narrative perspective begins with *miratus* (he marveled) at line 12 and *vidit* (he saw) at line 13.

The first two images that Pompey perceives align quite well with the objective description of the region that precedes the internal focalization: *stellasque vagas* (wandering celestial figures) at line 9.12 and *astra/ fixa polis* (the stars fixed on the poles) at lines 9.12-13. However, the third image does not align with the first two or with the description of the cosmos that Lucan provides from zero focalization.

From this cosmological vantage point Pompey also appears to notice his own decapitated body on the Egyptian shore: *vidit quanta sub nocte iaceret/ nostra dies risitque sui ludibria trunci* (he saw under how great a night our day rests and he laughed at the mockery of his decapitated corpse, 13-14). After viewing the true light, stars, the orbit of the moon and how the night moves, Pompey laughs at his corpse and appears to see his corpse far away on Earth. This statement disrupts the reader because it requires the reader to believe that Pompey can see his corpse on Earth while also seeing the breadth of the cosmos. It is important to note that *vidit* (see) does not take *ludibria trunci* (the mockery of his decapitated corpse) as its direct object and that the verb which does take Pompey's corpse as a direct object is *risit* (laughed). It is, however, strange that Pompey laughs (*risit*) at his corpse if the reader is not meant to believe that Pompey also sees his corpse.

There are multiple ways to interpret this issue. It should be recalled that Pompey will fly back to Earth and over the same Thessalian field which I analyzed in the previous section. Therefore, this perception of his corpse could be interpreted as the beginning of his imminent earthward journey (i.e., his journey over the plains of

Thessaly and eventually towards Cato and Brutus). However, at line 12 Pompey (where *risit* appears) still appears to be far out in the ether and it is from this distant position that he laughs at his corpse far away on Earth. This reading is made possible by Lucan's use of *hinc* (from here) which precedes *volitavit* (fly) and is the means of Pompey's journey to Earth. Pompey does not begin to fly towards Earth and away from the cosmos until line 15 and this journey does not appear to be the reason that Pompey sees his corpse on earth.

There is also the possibility that Pompey is laughing at the corpse as it appears in his memory or imagination; however, Lucan does not provide an instance in which Pompey surveys his corpse prior to this possible remembrance. Lucan only tells the reader that Pompey sees night's celestial function and that Pompey also laughs at his own corpse. In fact, Lucan describes both of these actions in the span of two lines and within the same sense unit. The different possible interpretations of this issue are revealed through a survey of translations. H.T. Riley,⁵⁵ Susan Braund⁵⁶ and Matthew Fox⁵⁷ translate *vidit* and *risit* separately and provide *risit* as the only definitive action which Pompey takes towards his corpse. However, Robert Graves' translation has Pompey imagining the corpse: "and as he glanced below him saw what a thick veil of darkness obscures our day; the thought of his headless body made him chuckle."⁵⁸ Joyce sees fit to solve the dilemma in a different way (by translating *vidit* twice): "he saw/ under how much night our day/ lay still/ and he smiled to see his corpse abused

⁵⁵ 1853: 338.

⁵⁶ 1995: 178.

⁵⁷ 2012: 249.

⁵⁸ 1957: 197.

and headless.”⁵⁹ The reader may be able to believe that Pompey *sees* his corpse and the implication is that Pompey at least perceives his own corpse (whether in his memory, imagination or visually). Because of Lucan’s manipulation of narrative perspective the reader sees the distant cosmos and Pompey’s body on Earth simultaneously which is disruptive for Lucan’s reader at multiple levels: first, the sight of Pompey’s body does not align with the objective narrative and second, Lucan’s reader may find such intergalactic vision to be something of an oddity.

Pompey, as in his dream, perceives himself during his apotheosis at 9.14. Pompey is viewing and perceiving himself in both the dream and in death and these instances are constructed in a similar fashion as both have a form of *video* (see) within the passages. Moreover, in both instances Pompey sees alternate versions of himself (as a youth in Book 7 and as a headless corpse in Book 9). The beginning of the internal focalization in Book 9 brings the reader back to the beginning of Book 7 and presents the reader with a similar challenge. The reader must evaluate Pompey’s visualization of himself in both instances and this entirely subjective perspective presents the reader with a jarring manner of viewership through which the reader must assess Pompey’s assessment of himself.

I read this final part of the passage, in which Pompey enters Brutus and Cato, as a manner of possession which is not without precedent in Vergil and Lucan. In *Aeneid* 7, the Fury Allecto, at Juno’s urging, possesses both Amata and Turnus with madness. Vergil describes Amata’s possession by depicting her soul receiving the flame from Allecto: *animus toto percepit pectore flammam* (her soul felt the flame in her whole

⁵⁹ 1987: 230-231.

heart, 7.356). Turnus' possession is described with Allecto's insertion of a torch into his breast: *facem iuveni coniecit et atro/ lumine fumantis fixit sub pectore taedas* (she [Allecto] threw a torch at the youth [Turnus] and planted a torch smoking with gloomy light within his heart, 7.456-7). The language of Amata and Turnus' possession parallels Lucan's account of the possession of Brutus and Cato as both instances discuss possession by referring to the *pectus* of the possessed.

Furthermore, much of the language in Pompey's possession of Brutus and Cato recalls the witch Erichtho's reanimation of the Thessalian soldier in Book 6 of the *Bellum Civile*. After Erichtho offers prayers to the underworld the soldier's soul is recalled by her prayers and pauses near her before repossessing his dead body: *Haec ubi fata caput spumantiaque ora levavit,/ aspicit astantem proiecti corporis umbram, /exanimes artus invisaque claustra timentem/ carceris antiqui. pavet ire in pectus apertum/ visceraque, et ruptas letali vulnere fibras* (when she had said these things, she lifted her head and foaming lips, she saw the shadow of the fallen corpse standing near, fearful of the inanimate limbs and hateful enclosures of its old prison. He was afraid to go into the open heart and viscera of the opening and the liver punctured by the lethal wound, 719-723). This soldier, described as a shade (*umbram*), will take possession of his own body through the heart, *in pectus* (through the breast). In Pompey's apotheosis he is also described as an *umbram* (shade) at 9.2 and he eventually settles into the heart of Brutus (*pectus*) and the mind (*mens*) of Cato. The language of the transmigration of Pompey's soul into Brutus and Cato is, therefore, similar to other instances of possession in Vergil and Lucan.

The impact of this possession on the remainder of Lucan's narrative should be noted before I examine another instance of internal focalization in Book 9. In Vergil's *Aeneid* the effect of Turnus' possession is immediate and long lasting as he becomes instantly incensed towards war: *arma amens fremit, arma toro tectisque requirit;/ saevit amor ferri et scelerata insania belli*, (loving weaponry, he growls, he seeks the weapons around his couch and in his home. Love for the sword and the criminal insanity of war rages, 7.460-461). After the possession Turnus is ready for war and he will be for the rest of the *Aeneid* until he is killed at the epic's conclusion. The effect of Pompey's possession of Cato is no less noticeable and immediate than Allecto's possession of Turnus: Lucan describes Cato's new, possessed, state as follows, *iam pectore toto/ Pompeianus erat* (now, he was a Pompeian with his whole heart, 23-24).⁶⁰ Beyond this indication of Pompey's continued presence through the character of Cato, others have noted the symbolic nature of this possession. J. Mira Seo, in her analysis of Cato, views Pompey's entrance into Brutus and Cato as the symbolic representation of the passage of Republican leadership.⁶¹ Such a reading is similar to Neil Bernstein's contention that this episode exhibits the "transmission of a historical legacy."⁶²

I believe that Pompey's possession of Brutus and Cato colors the rest of the book and epic. The casting of Pompey's 'shade' over this book is similar to the beginning of Book 7 in which Pompey's dream does not clearly end but, in a sense, continues throughout Book 7 and in Book 9 Pompey's longest dream, (death), does not

⁶⁰ Hardie 1993: 42 also points to this line as evidence for the effects of Pompey's possession. It should be noted that Easton 2011: 214 labels the possession of Brutus and Cato "passive."

⁶¹ 2010: 216.

⁶² 2010: 267.

end or leave the narrative but sets the tone for the entire book through the possession of Cato who will occupy most of the action of this book until the narrative shifts to Caesar.

Lucan's narrative then follows Cato who briefly goes to Corcyra and then Africa where he is joined by Cornelia, Pompey's widow (19-217). After quelling a possible mutiny and a storm which threatens his fleet, Cato marches to Numidia to join forces with the African King Juba (218-492) at which point Lucan presents an *excursus* on the landscape of Libya (514-557). Cato's forces, the last vestiges of the Pompeian cause, are afflicted by a sandstorm during this march (558-638) on which Cato refuses to consult the oracle of Ammon (639-737). This disastrous march continues until Cato's beleaguered forces reach Leptis on the North African coast where they will winter (738-1177) and at this point the narrative shifts to Caesar at Troy in his pursuit of Pompey.

As referenced above, this book's treatment of Caesar also parallels the treatment of Caesar in Book 7. Caesar's tour of the Trojan ruins comes near the book's conclusion just as his surveying of the Thessalian landscape did in Book 7. Moreover, Caesar's visit to the ruins of Troy is the first instance of Caesar surveying landscape since he surveyed Thessaly after the Battle of Pharsalus (7.786-796). In fact, this is Caesar's first appearance since the episode after the Battle of Pharsalus. In the interim, Caesar has left Pharsalia in pursuit of Pompey who dies in Egypt at lines 8.595-604. As Lucan reintroduces Caesar he immediately reminds the reader of Caesar's reaction to the carnage at the Battle of Pharsalus: *Caesar, ut Emathia satiatus clade recessit,/ cetera curarum proiecit pondera soli/ intentus genero* (Caesar, after he was sated by the

Emathian slaughter, departed and cast aside all other points of concern, intent only on his son-in-law [Pompey], 9.950-953). In pursuit of his vanquished and deceased former son-in-law,⁶³ Caesar tours the ruins of Troy and before he offers sacrifices to the gods (987-999) Caesar's reviews the Trojan landscape.

This episode has been of particular importance to studies of Caesar's characterization and role in Lucan's epic. Otto Zwierlein, in his comprehensive⁶⁴ assessment of this episode, discusses portions of the narrative which foreshadow Caesar's important comparison to Alexander the Great at the beginning of Book 10.⁶⁵ Kirk Ormand, whose analysis I shall return to, contends that this episode displays Caesar's role as a "reader" in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*⁶⁶ while Johnson views this episode as one of the two best example's in the *Bellum Civile* of Caesar's role as Lucan's muse and as an episode which exemplifies Caesar's "pompous" concern with his posterity.⁶⁷

Other commentators have noted important intertextual elements in this episode. Lynette Thompson and R.T. Bruère refer to the relationship between this episode and Aeneas' visit to Pallanteum in *Aeneid* 8⁶⁸ as a means for Lucan to distance his epic from Vergil's *Aeneid*. Beyond these intertextual concerns, I contend that Lucan's narrative structure in this episode contains a similar disruption to the one I analyzed while Caesar

⁶³ Caesar does not discover that Pompey has died until 9. 1032-1043 after Caesar is done surveying Troy.

⁶⁴ Much of Zwierlein's article is concerned with Lucan's apostrophe at 9.980-986 which is not directly related to my present discussion.

⁶⁵ 2010: 417-421.

⁶⁶ 2011: 338-345.

⁶⁷ 1987: 119.

⁶⁸ 2010: 142-143.

observed the Thessalian slaughter in Book 7. Specifically, this episode contains shifts in narrative perspective which disrupt the reader's ability to perceive the ruins of Troy.

This episode begins with Caesar walking around the ruins of Troy and actively seeking out the remnants of his ancestral homeland among the nearly vanished physical state of these ruins that are described as overrun by the effects of nature and time. Caesar observes numerous sights among these ruins and even passes by some ruins without noticing them until a native guide provides more information about the ruins Caesar is unable to see. The lines follow.

circumit exustae nomen memorabile Troiae	
magnaue Phoebei quaerit vestigia muri.	965
iam silvae steriles et putres robore trunci	
Assaraci pressere domos et templa deorum	
iam lassa radice tenent, ac tota teguntur	
Pergama dumetis: etiam periere ruinae.	
aspicit Hesiones scopulos silvaeque latentis	970
Anchisae thalamos; quo iudex sederit antro,	
unde puer raptus caelo, quo vertice Nais	
luxerit Oenone: nullum est sine nomine saxum.	
inscius in sicco serpentem pulvere rivum	
transierat, qui Xanthus erat. securus in alto	975
gramine ponebat gressus: Phryx incola manes	
Hectoreos calcare vetat. discussa iacebant	
saxa nec ullius faciem servantia sacri:	
'Herceas' monstrator ait 'non respicis aras?'	

[He (Caesar) wanders through the memorable name of Troy, destroyed by fire, and he seeks the vast remains of the Apollonian Wall. Now the barren forests and decaying trunks have pressed upon the home of Assaracus and they cling to the temples of the gods with exhausted roots, and all of Pergamon is gripped by thickets: even the ruins have perished. He sees crags of Hesione and the wedding chambers of Anchises concealed by woods; where the Judge sat in the cave, from where the boy was snatched into the sky, from which peak the Naiad Enone shone: no rock is without a name. Unknowing, he went across the river crawling in dry dust which was the Xanthus. Careless he placed his step in the thick grass: a Phrygian native forbade him from treading upon Hector's shadow. The rocks lay, tossed about and do not preserve the sight of anything sacred: the guide says, 'do you not see the altars of Zeus Herceus?']

There are verbal echoes between this passage and Pompey's apotheosis from the beginning of the book which remind the reader of Pompey's presence and the long shadow cast by his spirit over the narrative. Lucan's use of *trunci* (966) to describe the decaying woods over the Trojan ruins recalls Lucan's use of *trunci* to describe Pompey's truncated corpse (14). In fact, Lucan's use of this noun to describe Pompey looks back to Lucan's first description of Pompey in Book 1: *nudosque per aera ramos/ effundens, trunco, non frondibus, efficit umbram* (stretching out exposed branches through the air, it achieves a shadow not with leaves but with a trunk, 139-140). It is significant that Lucan once more incorporates *truncus* in this book which has already been colored by Pompey's apotheosis and subsequent possession of Brutus and Cato. In this instance the reader is reminded of the shade of Pompey hanging over this book and over Caesar's actions now that the narrative has left Cato. There is also the echo between the participles *exustae* at 964 and *semusta* 9. In Lucan's description of Caesar walking around Troy, *exusta* (burned up by fire) is the first adjective used to describe the ruined city, while in Pompey's apotheosis the descriptor *semusta* (half burned) carries a similarly ruinous weight and is used to describe Pompey's limbs. The later passage begins with verbal echoes from the beginning of Book 9, thus forging a link for the reader between Pompey and Troy as burned carcasses.

In this passage, Lucan presents the observations of the ruins of Troy from three different perspectives: Caesar's internally focalized narrative perspective (970-973), the external narration from Lucan's own perspective (964-969, 974-975) and, lastly, the introduction of a third perspective in the form of the Phrygian guide (976-979), who addresses Caesar in the second person. These different perspectives are all trained

upon the same thing: the ruins of Troy. As I go through this passage I will analyze how Lucan's treatment of these three perspectives presents a challenge for his reader.

Through Lucan's manipulation of these multiple perspectives in this passage, Lucan, as I discussed in my analysis of Book 7, disrupts his reader's expectations and preconceptions concerning what is real and what is illusory in the *Bellum Civile*.

I shall first deal with the narrative as it reveals Caesar's perspective. In this passage Lucan sends Caesar in pursuit of something he cannot find. At line 965 Lucan informs the reader that Caesar seeks the ruins of Troy in the form of the remnants of Apollo's wall. However, at line 969 Lucan also informs the reader that the ruins of Troy no longer exist: *etiam periire ruinae* (even the ruins have perished). This could be read as a hyperbolic aside by Lucan concerning the utter destruction of Troy and the effects of time on the remains of the city, as Andreola Rossi has argued.⁶⁹ In this reading Lucan is detailing the extent of the devastation hyperbolically: the reader is not meant to take line 969 seriously but to recognize that Lucan is using line 969 simply to describe the degree of destruction at Troy and not to actually point out that the ruins are gone. This reading is entirely plausible but I am inclined to take 969 as it is: a straightforward comment on the ruins of Troy. I do not read this as a hyperbolic aside but a factual comment on the state of the ruins: destroyed. I contend that Lucan crafts the narrative in such a way that the reader believes Caesar is seeking something that is not there. Therefore, this line prompts the reader to expect that Caesar will not be able to see anything despite his wish to do so.

⁶⁹ 2001: 314.

In spite of the assertion that there are no ruins for Caesar to survey at Troy, Lucan introduces Caesar's experience of these ruins with a verb of seeing, *aspicit*⁷⁰ (perceive) at line 970 and thereby confounds the reader's expectation that Caesar's search would be in vain. Moreover, as Lucan does this he also internally focalizes the narrative perspective and restricts the reader's perspective to Caesar's as Caesar sees these ruins that should not be there for viewing.

If the reader decides to disregard the contradictory nature of line 969 and accept that Lucan presents ruins that he has claimed are not there, the manner in which Caesar sees the unexpected sight is still problematic. Caesar first sees the ancient bedrooms of Anchises, which we will return to in detail later. These bedrooms and all of the other 'structures'⁷¹ that Caesar sees must be ruins if they exist at all. However, the reader and Caesar peer into the mythological past in place of the ruins of Troy.⁷² As Caesar looks at the following ruins, the Judgment of Paris at 971, the capture of Ganymede at 972 and the place where the Naiad Enone was trapped at 972-973, Lucan presents the world of myth before Caesar's eyes in place of ruins. Ormand points out the interesting way that Caesar sees Troy: "Caesar does not see the ruins of Anchises' bedchamber, for example, but the chamber itself."⁷³ I believe that this strange vision is pertinent to my discussion of disruptive narrative perspective. As Ormand

⁷⁰ O.L.D., s.v., *aspicit* definition 1: "To notice with the eyes, catch sight of, observe."

⁷¹ Many of these landmarks were not necessarily ever engineered structures but these mythological scenes may have taken place outdoors.

⁷² Hannah 2007: 176 contends that Lucan crafts Caesar "walking around a poetic space that is merely evocative of its physical correspondent."

⁷³ 1994: 51.

points out, Caesar does not see the landscape as the reader expects, but he perceives mythological images in place of these ruins.

This challenge for the reader in assessing Caesar's perspective is reminiscent of Caesar's strange perception of the Thessalian landscape at Book 7 (786-796). In that episode Lucan restricted the reader's perspective to rivers propelled by slaughter in place of naturally moving rivers, and in this instance Caesar sees mythological events rather than mere ruins or destroyed ruins. Lucan presents Caesar's perception of the mythological past, monuments that are still standing and ruins that do not exist. Therefore, Lucan not only presents different perspectives but different types of images for the reader to perceive.

These are not the only impediments which Lucan presents his reader with at Troy: the bedrooms of Anchises are described as *latentis* (concealed, 9.970) and this description adds to the reader's challenge. The reader may ask, "How can Caesar see the bedrooms of Anchises if they are hidden?" One could read Lucan's use of *silva* (woods, 970) as describing the type of concealment. However, this would be hard to reconcile with Lucan's use of a verb of seeing, *aspicit* (see) which takes the hidden bedroom as a direct object. In other words, if the bedroom is hidden in the forest then Caesar is only able to see the forest but the direct object of *aspicit* is the bedroom of Anchises and not the *silva* (woods). Caesar and the reader are able to see things that are concealed and, as a result, Caesar and the reader not only perceive something that should not be there (keeping in mind Lucan's assertion at 969), but they can also view something hidden from view. To put it simply, the reader and Caesar must perceive an image that, by Lucan's chosen descriptor (*latentis*), they should not be able to see. The

effect of this paradox is a disruption of the reader's ability to understand what it is that he is seeing from Caesar's perspective.

I shall now examine this narrative as it relates to Lucan's perspective in the form of the external narration which begins at 974. By introducing this second perspective, Lucan removes the reader from within Caesar's eyes and places the reader in a different focalization through which the reader can see more than Caesar, and by doing this Lucan challenges the reader's understanding of what he is perceiving at Troy. Lucan shifts the narrative perspective in this instance from an internal to an external focalization. Genette defines external focalization as instances of narrative in which the reader does not know the thoughts or feelings of the characters.⁷⁴ As discussed above, external focalization is different from zero focalization which represents an entirely omniscient and objective narrative perspective. Lucan's narrative, as he shifts the narrative perspective to external focalization, is still restricted to an external assessment of Caesar's actions and does not describe Caesar's thoughts or emotions. Lucan's shift is pronounced: the reader goes from a restricted perspective in which he can only see Troy as Caesar does to one in which he can assess Caesar's perceptions of Troy from a removed position. Once this second perspective is introduced Caesar is described as *inscius* (unwitting) at 974 and *securus* (careless) at 975 as he crosses monuments that he is unable to see. Previously the reader saw the ruins of Troy along with Caesar but now Lucan makes his reader aware of all the ruins that Caesar cannot see.⁷⁵ Because

⁷⁴ 1980: 190, Schmitz 2007: 57, in classifying Genette's theory, defines external focalization: "In external focalization, readers perceive all characters from an external perspective; hence, they have no knowledge of their thoughts and emotions."

⁷⁵ It is worth noting that Vergil describes Aeneas' perception of his shield during the *ekphrasis* in Book 8 of the Aeneid by using similar words: Vergil writes that Aeneas *miratur* (marvels, 8.619) and describes Vulcan's knowledge of future events by way of negating *inscius* (unknowing, 8.627).

these two perspectives present opposite images of the Trojan ruins, Lucan's reader must assess the veracity of the images that were presented from Caesar's perspective (970-973) as well as the veracity of the images which the reader is perceiving from this external perspective. The reader is unable to decide which Troy he should perceive. In other words, the reader must question which narrative perspective has presented an accurate description of Troy: the one internally focalized within Caesar (970-973) or the external focalization (964-969, 974-979)? Without the ability to fully believe in the veracity of either version of the ruins of Troy the reader's perspective is confounded.

The problem for the reader is similar to the challenges present during Caesar's survey of the Thessalian plains. In that instance, the reader is unable to distinguish between the expected features of Thessaly (a land containing normal rivers and natural mountains) and the version of Thessaly characterized only by slaughter which Caesar sees. The perplexing ambiguity which I analyzed earlier in Lucan's narrative of Caesar viewing Thessaly parallels the opposing visions of Troy that Lucan has crafted in this instance in which the reader is unable to decide whether the images from myth that he sees from Caesar's perspective are false or whether the image of Caesar's ignorance is false. Should the reader believe that Caesar is simply insane in both of these instances and that, in his madness, he is seeing images that are not there? Or, perhaps, the reader should believe that Lucan, with an ant-Caesarian intent, allows Caesar to see mythological images at Troy which relate positively to his Julian ancestry (the union of his ancestor with the goddess Venus) while he ignores images that do not relate as positively to his ancestry (the tomb of Hector). Such a reading follows the interpretation

of Andreola Rossi, who labels Caesar in this passage as “deviously selective.”⁷⁶

Ultimately, Lucan’s manipulation of narrative perspective in this passage presents the possibility that both Caesar’s internally focalized perspective and Lucan’s externally focalized perspective are believable, and leaves the reader unable to trust either perspective of the Trojan ruins.

Lastly, I shall examine the perspective of the guide who appears at 976. Before Lucan proceeds to his account of the sacrifices that Caesar offers at Troy, he inserts a second character into this episode. Along with Caesar, who is still attempting to perceive the ruins of Troy, Lucan introduces a *Phryx incola* (Phrygian native, 976). Mark Thorne, in his analysis of the importance of *memoria* in the *Bellum Civile*, contends that the guide’s advice to Caesar plays an important part in restoring a “fuller *memoria*” to the passage as an impetus for future generations of Roman readers to restore all that was lost in the civil war, namely *Roma* and *Libertas*.⁷⁷ Ahl and Bartsch also note the importance of the guide in making Troy more than an archaeological site.⁷⁸ I believe that the guide is also important because he represents Lucan’s introduction of a third perspective onto the Trojan ruins.

As the reader observes Caesar about to cross over an important ruin without noticing it, Lucan trains the reader’s attention upon this additional character. The guide first warns Caesar that he is about to step on the burial place of Hector: *Phryx incola manes/ Hectoreos calcare vetat* (a Phrygian native forbade him from treading upon Hector’s shade, 9.976-977). This guide, as a native to this region, has knowledge that is

⁷⁶ 2001: 315.

⁷⁷ 2011: 380-381.

⁷⁸ 1976: 215.

different from either perspective that has been introduced thus far. He knows more than Caesar and his perspective also differs from Lucan's removed vantage point. The guide interjects: '*Herceas' monstrator ait 'non respicis aras?*' (the guide says, 'Do you not see the altars of Zeus Herceus?' 979). In this episode the guide is showing his perception of the ruins directly to Caesar and indirectly to the reader. This is underscored by Lucan's use of the second person singular. The guide's presence contains yet another distinct perspective for the reader to assess as he attempts to view the Trojan ruins. His question to Caesar also jolts the reader into 'looking' again to see what he has missed.

This passage contains different focalizations of narrative perspective (964, 976) through which the reader is unable to determine which beholder most accurately discerns the ruins of Troy. This passage also contains sights that are difficult to believe from the internally focalized perspective of Caesar: ruins that Lucan claims should not exist, mythological images in place of these ruins and the marriage chamber of Anchises which is described as hidden. These issues and the presence of divergent perspectives challenge the reader's ability to believe in any one perspective of the ruins of Troy. The Phrygian guide may not only be addressing Caesar at this point but may also be bringing the difficulty of perception in the passage directly to the reader's attention. In other words, the guide could be directly addressing the reader: Do you clearly see the ruins of Troy as you read *Bellum Civile* 9.964-979? The answer is no. The result of the introduction of this third perspective is, once again, a disruption of the reader's ability to perceive the ruins of Troy. Although Lucan's use of Troy specifically is itself noteworthy I do not ascribe any significance to the location of Troy itself within the

scope of my analysis except that Caesar's perspective surveys Troy in a way which challenges Lucan's reader.

Both of these passages in Book 9, Pompey's apotheosis (1-18) and Caesar's visit to Troy (964-979), represent Lucan's disruptive manipulation of narrative perspective in the *Bellum Civile*. The narrative structure in these passages, through shifts in and out of different focalizations, the representation of unexpected images, the implication of the reader's presence with the deictic adverb *illic* (11) and the second person address (979), disrupt the reader's understanding of what is perceivable in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*. Since the ruins of Troy are a memory of past events, Lucan even confounds how the reader interprets the past – there are many views and perspectives presented in this passage, all of them conflicting, many of them subjective or partial or fantastic. Ultimately, it is impossible to tell what is real about the ruins of Troy in the *Bellum Civile*.

At the conclusion of Book 9 Pompey's shadow continues to cast itself over the narrative and begin to haunt Caesar. After leaving Troy and sailing to Egypt, Caesar is brought the head of Pompey by one of the Pharaoh's agents (1000-1034). The presence of Pompey's head is pertinent to my discussion because the decapitated state of Pompey's corpse is the reason that his corpse is described as *trunci* (truncated) at 9.14 and this noun was also used during the tree simile which initially depicted Pompey *trunco* (with its trunk, 1.140). This is not an instance of internal focalization, as the narrative perspective of this passage is set in zero focalization, but this is an instance which draws the reader's attention to the perspective of Caesar. After addressing Caesar, the Pharaoh's agent reveals the head for Caesar's inspection:

Sic fatus, opertum
detexit tenuitque caput. iam languida morte
effigies habitum noti mutaverat oris.
non primo Caesar damnavit munera visu
avertitque oculos; vultus dum crederet, haesit;
utque fidem vidit sceleris tutumque putavit
iam bonus esse socer,

[Thus he spoke and uncovered the covered head and held it out. Now relaxed by death the visage had changed the characteristics of its familiar face. Caesar did not damn the gift at the first sight, nor did he turn away his eyes; until he believed the face, his gaze dwelled; and when he saw the certainty of the crime and thought that it was now safe to be a good father-in-law.]

The reader is able to observe Caesar's reaction to the head of Pompey but is not prompted to see Pompey as Caesar sees Pompey. Caesar's perspective approaches the sight of Pompey with the same vigor that I have analyzed as he surveys the landscape in Books 7 and 9. Lucan describes how Caesar does not turn away his eyes, *non ... avertitque oculos* (nor⁷⁹ did he avert his eyes, 1036) and his perspective even clings to the sight of Pompey, *haesit* (dwelled).⁸⁰ This episode calls attention to a strand which I have been tracing from Book 1 which is the shadow of Pompey as it inches closer to Caesar.

I have analyzed how Lucan's manipulation of narrative perspective in Book 9 disrupts his reader's perception in multiple ways. First, Pompey's perspective during his apotheosis disrupts the reader's ability to trust what he perceives through the eyes of Pompey because Pompey perceives his corpse on earth and the distant cosmos simultaneously. Second, I have discussed how Lucan's account of Caesar's visit to the Trojan ruins presents the reader with multiple, differing viewpoints which assess the

⁷⁹ See Haskins 1887: 358.

80 *ibid.*

same ruins. The inclusion of these multiple and varied perspectives, by focalizing the narrative perspective (and therefore restricting the reader's point of view) through these divergent vantage points of Caesar, Lucan, and the Phrygian guide, disrupts the reader's ability to perceive Troy. As with Book 7, Lucan uses the perspectives of Pompey and Caesar to disrupt the reader's ability to perceive the events of the *Bellum Civile*. Such disruption will be picked up at the 'conclusion' of Lucan's epic in which Caesar encounters the shadow of Pompey in Lucan's final instance of internally focalized narrative perspective in Book 10.

Section 4: Conclusion

I have argued that Lucan's manipulation of narrative perspective in the *Bellum Civile* disrupts his reader's ability to perceive what is real and what is illusory. Lucan achieves this effect by manipulating the dichotomy between internal and zero focalization. Lucan uses internal focalization to restrict the reader's perspective to the subjective perspective of an individual character; I have focused my discussion on the characters of Pompey and Caesar. The subjective perspectives that Lucan crafts do not always present the events of the *Bellum Civile* as the reader may expect but the internal viewer appears to see a version of the narrative (whether during dreams, apotheosis, or surveying landscape) that is at variance with the objective narrative. Another instance of such a disruption exists in Lucan's own conclusion in Book 10 of his epic and, for this reason, I believe that a brief analysis of this instance is an appropriate means to conclude my argument.

Although Book 10 does not begin, as books 7 and 9 did, with Pompey's perspective, Lucan references Pompey's death at the book's beginning in describing

Caesar's pursuit: *Ut primum terras Pompei colla secutus/ attigit et diras calcavit Caesar harenas,/ pugnavit fortuna ducis fatumque nocentis/ Aegypti*, (having pursued the neck of Pompey, as soon as Caesar touched land and trampled on the dreadful shores, the fortune of the leader fought with the fate of wicked Egypt, 10.1-4).⁸¹ Lucan refers to Pompey's *colla* (neck) which evokes the image of Pompey's decapitated corpse at the beginning of Book 9 (14) and in doing this he invites the reader to recall the ruined state of Pompey's corpse which Caesar has been pursuing. I believe that Lucan's reference to Pompey at the very beginning of Book 10 continues to cast the shadow of Pompey over the narrative of this book. As in Book 7 where Pompey's dream does not end and in Book 9 where Pompey's apotheosis sets the tone through his possession of Cato, Book 10 is also shaded by Pompey's presence from the outset.

The narrative of Book 10 continues in Egypt where Caesar visits the tomb of Alexander the Great (1-16) and Lucan presents a lengthy aside in which he scorns Alexander (14-46). Caesar then meets and banquets with Cleopatra (53-171) after which the narrative shifts to the Egyptian court where the eunuch Pothinus, regent for Cleopatra's brother Ptolemy XII, urges his general Achillas to murder Caesar (332-433). After assembling the Egyptian forces, Achillas besieges Caesar in the palace (434-503); Caesar then escapes to the island of Pharos but continues to be harassed by Egyptian forces and it is in this position, with Caesar on the brink of defeat, that the *Bellum Civile* 'ends.' The debate over this conclusion of Lucan's epic has been considerable.

Before I discuss the final lines of the *Bellum Civile* I should examine the nature of this ending. At only 546 lines Lucan's 10th book does not appear to be complete nor

⁸¹ For a discussion of Lucan's use of *fata* and *fatum* in this passage see Dick 1967: 236.

does it conclude in any traditional manner but rather ends abruptly with Caesar stuck at Pharos. Moreover, there exists no precedent for Lucan to present his epic poem in only 10 books. Because of these issues and the untimely nature of Lucan's death many have dismissed the possibility that this ending is Lucan's intended conclusion.⁸² However, recent scholarship has raised the possibility that Lucan's poem, as we have it, is complete. Jamie Masters writes, "the best evidence for the intended ending of the poem is the place where it does, in fact, end."⁸³ Jonathan Tracy argues for the poem's completeness based on internal evidence from the structure of Book 10, drawing attention to the priest Acoreus' description of the Nile River (10.193-331). He believes that the shared language of the end of this episode mirrors the language at the end of Book 10 itself. Particularly pertinent to our discussion of Lucan's disruptive elements is Tracy's contention that the abruptness of Lucan's ending at 10.546 is supported by the abruptness of the ending of Acoreus' earlier description.⁸⁴ My aim here is not to prove that line 10.546 is the intended ending of Lucan's poem. However, because this is the ending we have and recent scholarship has at least raised the possibility that this is Lucan's intended ending, I believe that it is permissible to treat it as such and examine how this 'abrupt' ending ends. Moreover, this passage will help to reiterate my argument about the way Lucan internally focalizes narrative perspective for a disruptive effect.

⁸² Such a reading can be traced to Thomas May's 1633 *Supplementum Lucani* which is a continuation of Lucan's poem to the point of Caesar's assassination in 44 BC. More recently see Rose 1996: 389 and Lintott 1971: 488. For a comprehensive summary of modern scholars who envisage the *Bellum Civile* as incomplete as well as a convincing rebuttal of their arguments see Masters 1992: 234-259. On Lucan's death see Fantham 2011 (throughout) and also Masters 1992: 216-234 for a summary of the historical accounts of Lucan's death.

⁸³ 1992: 216.

⁸⁴ 2011.

In Lucan's final passage of the *Bellum Civile* (10.540-546) he presents Caesar on the island of Pharos, pursued by Egyptian forces, and describes Caesar's brief moment of panic (10.542-543). As Caesar looks out at the battle Lucan shifts the narrative perspective to Caesar, who does not see Egyptian forces but his dead soldier, Scaeva, and his deceased foe, Pompey. Scaeva's heroism is recalled before Pompey appears at the final word, toppling walls. In the final four lines (543-546) of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* (beginning on 543) he internally focalizes the narrative perspective within Caesar. The lines of interest are as follows.

non acie fusa nec magnae stragis acervis	540
vincendus tunc Caesar erat sed sanguine nullo.	
captus sorte loci pendet; dubiusne timeret	
optaretne mori respexit in agmine denso	
Scaevam perpetuae meritum iam nomina fama	
ad campos, Epidamne, tuos, ubi solus apertis	545
obsedit muris calcantem moenia Magnum.	

[Not with the battle-line in retreat nor with a heap of great slaughter was Caesar then to be conquered, indeed, not with any blood. Caught by the chance of his position he waits; he is unsure whether he should fear or desire to die. In the dense throng he sees Scaeva already having warranted the reputation of perpetual fame on your fields, Epidamnus, where he alone, with the bulwarks breached, besieged Magnus toppling the walls].

As in Books 7 and 9, there is a correlation between the place that Caesar is in and what Caesar sees. Caesar is defeated because of his relationship to this final location at Pharos in Book 10 and, in a sense, because of his relationship to 'location' itself as he is caught by the word *locus* at 541: *captus sorte loci* (caught by the chance of his position). In other words, Caesar is cornered because of the physical restrictions of the island of Pharos. I have been tracing Caesar's perspective as it relates to different locales throughout my analysis: I have examined Lucan's use of the word *locus* to describe what Caesar sees in Thessaly in Book 7 and in the region of Troy in Book 9.

In this final description of Caesar Lucan once again draws attention to locale before he allows the reader to see as Caesar sees two lines later at 543.

After Caesar is stuck in this final location in Book 10, Lucan focalizes Caesar's perspective of Egypt as he did in Book 7 in Thessaly and Book 9 in Troy. Lucan once again presents something to the reader that is unexpected when he internally focalizes the narrative perspective at 10.543 with *respexit* (see).⁸⁵ Caesar does not see his present circumstance but rather he sees his soldier Scaeva who died earlier in Book 6 (252-257) after defending Dyracchium against Pompey's onslaught: *respexit in agmine denso Scaevam perpetuae meritum iam nomina famae/ ad campos, Epidamne, tuos, ubi solus/ apertis/ obsedit muris calcantem moenia Magnum* (In the dense throng he sees Scaeva already having warranted the reputation of perpetual fame on your fields, Epidamnus, where he alone, with the bulwarks breached, besieged Magnus toppling the walls, 10.543-546). Instead of seeing his own precarious situation, Caesar sees his former soldier besieging Pompey in an episode far away both in terms of time and geography: Caesar is at Pharos, in Egypt, and should be perceiving the Egyptian forces assaulting him there, he is not at Dyracchium on the Epidamnian fields, witnessing Scaeva's last stand which took place in Book 6.

Moreover, Lucan's use of *calcantem* at 10.546 recalls his use of the same verb at 10.2, *calcavit*. Interestingly, Lucan uses this verb at the beginning of Book 10 to

⁸⁵On my translation of *respicio* here see O.L.D., s.v., *respicio* definition 1. It should be noted that this verb could also refer to memory (O.L.D., s.v., *respicio* definition 4). Masters 1992: 255-256 who contends that both senses are employed by Lucan, making sure to point out that Caesar never looks back into the past in a similar way earlier in the *Bellum Civile*. See also Sklenár 2003: 150n69 who writes "I have not found a parallel instance of *respicio* meaning "recall" with a person as direct object."

describe Caesar's pursuit of Pompey and at the end of Book 10 to describe Pompey's presence in Caesar's line of sight.

Caesar's perception of Pompey at 10.546 represents Lucan's final manipulation of the dichotomy between subjective and objective perspective in the *Bellum Civile* and is the final disruption for Lucan's reader. The objective narrative depicts Caesar in Egypt looking at the Egyptian advance, while Caesar's subjective perspective does not present this. Moreover, in this final passage Lucan restricts the narrative perspective to Caesar's subjective viewpoint, via internal focalization, and from Caesar's viewpoint presents something (the deceased Scaeva and Pompey) for the reader to interpret that does not agree with the objective narrative.

Pompey plays an important part within this episode as the final word and final force toppling the walls and inserting himself into Caesar's line of sight. Caesar can not avoid seeing Pompey which also draws the reader back to Pompey's initial description: *stat magni nominis umbra* (he stands, the shadow of a great name, 1.135). During this description from Book 1 Pompey is not dead in the objective narrative so *umbra* should not be translated as a "shade" on its way to the underworld but rather as a "shadow" which his name metaphorically casts. However, when he appears at 10.546 he is dead in the objective narrative and is a shade. This shade is only described by Pompey's name *Magnum* (great, 546). Therefore, in Lucan's epic Pompey transitions from the shadow of a great name (1.135) to the shade of his name, great (10.546). Pompey, as the shade of his great name, is present at the end of the *Bellum Civile* and continues to cast a shadow over the eyes of Caesar and Lucan's reader.

My analysis has centered on instances where Lucan focalizes the narrative perspective to the viewpoints of Pompey and Caesar. As I have discussed, both Pompey and Caesar do not always see their surroundings in an expected way but in a way that often differs from the objective narrative. In Book 7 the dreaming Pompey perceives historical events (real events) and his dream images (illusory images) equivocally (13-19) and in Book 9 he sees his corpse on earth and the distant cosmos simultaneously (12-14). On the other hand, Caesar sees gore instead of the physical landscape of Thessaly in Book 7 (789-796), he sees the mythological past in place of physical ruins in Book 9 (970-973), and he sees Pompey instead of the Egyptian army in Book 10 (543-546) at the conclusion of Lucan's epic.

As discussed above these episodes are not set in zero focalization (emblematic of what I have termed 'real' in the text) but internal focalization which is representative of a subjective and possibly illusory viewpoint. In the episodes discussed above, the narrative perspective is internally focalized to the vantage points of Pompey and Caesar, and thereby the reader's own perspective is restricted to these subjective viewpoints. Therefore, the reader is only able to perceive the events of the *Bellum Civile* from the vantage points of Pompey and Caesar which often disagree with the 'real' narrative and present an 'illusory' perception of the events of the *Bellum Civile*. Through Lucan's employment of the skewed vantage points of Pompey and Caesar, he disrupts his reader's ability to evaluate what is real and what is illusory in his epic poem.

Bibliography

- Ahl, F. 1976. *Lucan: An Introduction*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bartsch, S. 1995. *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Braund, S. 1992 *Lucan: Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 2009. *A Lucan Reader: Selections From Civil War*. Mundelein, Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc.
- 2011. "Violence in Translation." in P. Asso, ed., *Brill's Companion to Lucan*. 507-524. Boston: Leiden.
- 2011. "Introduction." In, ed., Charles Tesoriero, *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Lucan*. 1-15. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- D'Alessandro Behr, F. 2001. *Feeling History: Lucan, Stoicism, and the Poetics of Passion*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
- Dick, B. 1967. "Fatum and Fortuna in Lucan's Bellum Civile." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 62, No. 4, pp. 235-242.
- Dilke, O. 1965., ed., *M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili Liber VII*. Revised from the edition of J.P. Postgate. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Easton, S. 2011. "Why Lucan's Pompey is Better off Dead." *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 107, No. 2. pp. 212-223.
- Fantham, E., ed., 1992. *De Bello Civili: Book II*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 2010. "Caesar's Voice and Caesarian Voices." In N. Hoemke and C. Reitz, eds., *Lucan's 'Bellum Civile' Between Epic Tradition and Aesthetic Innovation*. 53-70. New York: Walter de Gruyter GmbH and Co.
- 2011. "A Controversial Life." In P. Asso, ed., *Brill's Companion to Lucan*. 3-20. Boston: Leiden 2011.
- Fox, M. 2012. *Lucan: Civil War*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Fratantuono, L. 2012. *Madness Triumphant: A Reading of Lucan's Pharsalia*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Genette, G. (1972). 1980. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

- Graves, R. 1957. *Lucan: Pharsalia, Dramatic Episodes of the Civil Wars*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Grimal, P. (1960). 2010. "Is the Eulogy of Nero at the Beginning of the *Pharsalia* Ironic?" In, ed., Charles Tesoriero, *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Lucan*. 59-68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hannah, B.G. 2007. *Exegi Monumentum: Architecture in Latin Epic*. Diss. Cornell.
- Haskins, C., and W.E. Heitland. 1887. *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*. London: George Bell and Sons.
- Henderson, J. (1987). 2010. "Lucan/ The Word at War." In, ed., Charles Tesoriero, *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Lucan*. 433-491. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Housman, A.E. 1927. *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis Libri Decem*. Glasgow: Blackwell.
- Johnson, W. 1987. *Momentary Monsters: Lucan and His Heroes*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Joyce, J. 1993. *Lucan: Pharsalia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Kubiak, D. 1985. *Lucan: Bellum Civile IX*. United States of America: Bryn Mawr Commentaries.
- Lintott, A. 1971. "Lucan and the History of the Civil War." *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 488-505.
- Masters, J. 1992. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Marti, B. 1945. "The Meaning of the *Pharsalia*." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 66, No. 4. pp. 352-376.
- Mayer, R. 1981. *Lucan Civil War VIII*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
- Mira Seo, J. "Lucan's Cato and the Poetics of Exemplarity." In P. Asso, ed., *Brill's Companion to Lucan*. 199-222. Boston: Leiden.
- Morford, M. 1967. *The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Narducci, E. 2002. *Lucano. Un'epica contra l'imperio: Interpretazione della 'Pharsalia.'* Florence: Editori Laterza.

- Nix, S. 2008. "Caesar as Jupiter in Lucan's 'Bellum Civile.'" *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 103, No. 3. pp. 281-294.
- Ormand, K. 1994. "Auctor Vix Fidelis." *Classical Antiquity*. Vol. 13, No. 1. pp. 38-55.
- Roche, P., ed., 2009. *Lucan: De Bello Civili, Book 1*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rolim de Moura, A. 2010. "Lucan 7: Speeches at War." In N. Hoemke and C. Reitz, eds., *Lucan's 'Bellum Civile' Between Epic Tradition and Aesthetic Innovation*. 71-90. New York: Walter de Gruyter GmbH and Co.
- Riley, H.T. 1852. *The Pharsalia of Lucan*. New York: Henry G. Bohn.
- Rosner-Siegel, J. (1983). 2010. "The Oak and the Lightning: Lucan, *Bellum Civile* 1.135-157." In, ed., Charles Tesoriero, *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Lucan*. 184-200. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rose, C. 1966. "Problems of Chronology in Lucan's Career." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 97, pp. 379-396.
- Rossi, A. 2001. "Remapping the Past: Caesar's Tale of Troy (Lucan *BC* 9.964-999)." *Phoenix* 55: 313-326.
- Shackleton-Bailey, D. R., ed., 1988. *Lucanus: De Bello Civili*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Schmitz, T. (2002). 2007. *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts: An Introduction*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Sklenár, R. 2003. *The Taste for Nothingness*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Thompson, L. and Bruère, R.T. (1968) 2010. "Lucan's Use of Virgilian Reminiscence." In, ed., Charles Tesoriero, *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Lucan*. 107-148. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thorne, M. 2011. "Memoria Redux: Memory in Lucan" In P. Asso, ed., *Brill's Companion to Lucan*. 363-382. Boston: Leiden.
- Tipping, B. 2010. "Lucan's Cato and the Poetics of Exemplarity." In P. Asso, ed., *Brill's Companion to Lucan*. 199-222. Boston: Leiden.
- Tracy, B. 2011. "Internal Evidence for the Completeness of the *Bellum Civile*." In P. Asso, ed., *Brill's Companion to Lucan*. 33-56. Boston: Leiden.
- Walde, C. 2001. *Die Traumdarstellungen in der griechisch-roemischen Dichtung*. Munich/Leipzig: K. G. Saur.

Weise, C. H., ed., 1835. *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsaliae Libri X*. Leipzig: G. Bassus.